

## Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated October 10, 2006, Applicant(s) respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

### 102 Rejections

Claims 10-16, 27-39, and 41 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nolting (US Pat 7,027,574). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections to the extent they apply to the currently pending claims.

### Claims 10-16, 27-31, 32, and 41

Independent claims 10, 27, 32, and 41 include similar recitations regarding communicating all call records, or all dial digits in the case of claim 27, from a switch master to a computing system directly via a communication link. As a representative example, claim 10 recites “[a] method for communicating all telecommunication call records ... comprising receiving all telecommunication call records from a plurality of remote telecommunication devices at a plurality of switches in communication with a switch master directly through a first communication link....” These recitations are supported by FIG. 4 and the related description. Nolting fails to disclose these recitations.

Nolting discloses that site processors assemble information related to inter-switch calls but do not handle intra-switch calls, col. 12, lines 22-25. Thus, because the site processors do not handle intra-switch calls, it is impossible for site processors to handle all call records such that the site processors cannot be equated to the communication link between the switches and switch master of the present claims. In Nolting, the Automated Message Accounting (AMA) data is handled by AMA equipment in order to account for the inadequacies of the site processor so that all calls may be monitored, col. 12, lines 25-28. However, the AMA system requires a separate AMA network 222 leading to a message processing server (MPS) 224 which then feeds data to an AMA server 226, as shown in FIG. 7.

There is nothing disclosed in Nolting regarding a switch master that receives all call records via a direct communication link to the switch(es) handling the calls. As shown in FIG. 7, there is a separate AMA network 222 filled with AMA equipment that records AMA information

about calls being handled by switches and then sends this AMA data to the MPS 224. For purposes of this argument only and without conceding to the presence of a switch master in Nolting, if one equates the MPS 224 to a switch master as claimed, there fails to be a direct communication of call records between the switch handling the call and the MPS 224. Instead, there is AMA equipment of the AMA network 222 that collects the AMA data and sends it to the MPS 224. Thus, the disclosure of Nolting fails to account for all of the recitations of the claims. Therefore, claims 10-16, 27-31, 32, and 41 are allowable over Nolting for at least these reasons.

Furthermore, claim 27 additionally recites “transmitting all the dial digits received over a period of time from the plurality of switches to the switch master in real time relative to the termination of the telecommunications transactions, wherein the switch master is in communication with at least a billing system directly through a second communication link and a computer system directly through a third communication link....” These recitations are also supported by FIG. 4 and the related description.

Regarding claim 27, Nolting fails to disclose the direct communication link between the switch master and switch(es) handling the calls and also fails to disclose the direct communication link between this switch master and a billing system and the direct communication link between this switch master and the computer system. Thus, Nolting fails to disclose all of these recitations of claim 27 such that claim 27 is allowable over Nolting for at least these additional reasons.

#### Claims 33-39

Independent claims 33 and 37 include recitations to a switch master that executes a script upon receiving a command from the user. As a representative example, claim 33 recites “the switch master maintaining a script in memory to cause incoming call records to be forwarded by the switch master and the switch master providing a log in for remotely accessing the switch master from the computer, wherein the switch master receives a user command to execute the script....” These recitations are supported in relation to FIGs. 4 and 5 and the related description, particularly at page 39. Nolting fails to disclose these recitations.

There is no disclosure of a switch master in Nolting, particularly one that maintains a script in memory where the script causes incoming call records to be forwarded and that provides a log in for remote access to the switch master. There is also no disclosure in Nolting regarding

receiving a user command to execute the script that causes the incoming call records to be forwarded. Accordingly, Nolting fails to disclose all of the recitations of claims 33-39 such that claims 33-39 are allowable over Nolting.

### Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 10-16, 27-39, and 41 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 10, 2007

/Jeramie J. Keys/

Jeramie J. Keys  
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355  
(404) 849.2093